



Charmousis, Christos and Copeland, Edmund J. and Padilla, Antonio and Saffin, Paul M. (2012) General second-order scalar-tensor theory and self-tuning. Physical Review Letters, 108 (5). 051101/1-051101/. ISSN 1079-7114

**Access from the University of Nottingham repository:**

<http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/42138/1/1106.2000.pdf>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:  
[http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end\\_user\\_agreement.pdf](http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf)

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact [eprints@nottingham.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@nottingham.ac.uk)

# General second order scalar-tensor theory, self tuning, and *the Fab Four*

Christos Charmousis,<sup>1,2</sup> Edmund J. Copeland,<sup>3</sup> Antonio Padilla,<sup>3</sup> and Paul M. Saffin<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*LPT, CNRS UMR 8627, Université Paris Sud-11, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France.*

<sup>2</sup>*LMPT, CNRS UMR 6083, Université François Rabelais-Tours, 37200, France*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK*

(Dated: June 17, 2011)

Starting from the most general scalar-tensor theory with second order field equations in four dimensions, we establish the unique action that will allow for the existence of a consistent self-tuning mechanism on FLRW backgrounds, and show how it can be understood as a combination of just four base Lagrangians with an intriguing geometric structure dependent on the Ricci scalar, the Einstein tensor, the double dual of the Riemann tensor and the Gauss-Bonnet combination. Spacetime curvature can be screened from the net cosmological constant at any given moment because we allow the scalar field to break Poincaré invariance on the self-tuning vacua, thereby evading the Weinberg no-go theorem. We show how the four arbitrary functions of the scalar field combine in an elegant way opening up the possibility of obtaining non-trivial cosmological solutions.

In a little known paper published in 1974, G.W. Horndeski presented the most general scalar-tensor theory with second order field equations in four dimensions [1]. Given the amount of research into modified gravity over the last ten years or so (see [2] for a review), it seems appropriate to revisit Horndeski's work. Scalar tensor models of modified gravity range from Brans-Dicke gravity [3] to the recent models [4, 5] inspired by galileon theory [6], the latter being examples of higher order scalar tensor Lagrangians with second order field equations. Each of these models represent a special case of Horndeski's panoptic theory.

In this letter, we study Horndeski's theory on FLRW backgrounds. In particular we ask whether or not there are subclasses of [1] giving a viable self-tuning mechanism for solving the (old) cosmological constant problem. In other words, we ask if one can completely screen the spacetime curvature from the net cosmological constant. Naively one might expect this to be impossible on account of Weinberg's no-go theorem [7]. However, Weinberg not only assumes Poincaré invariance at the level of the spacetime curvature but also at the level of the self-adjusting fields. Here we follow a route similar to [8] and allow our scalar field to break Poincaré invariance on the self-tuning vacua, whilst maintaining a flat spacetime geometry.

By demanding that the self-tuning mechanism continues to work through phase transitions that cause the vacuum energy to jump, we are able to impose some powerful restrictions on Horndeski's theory. Based on equivalence principle (EP) considerations, we assume that matter is only minimally coupled to the metric and then pass the model through our self-tuning filter. This reduces it to four base Lagrangians each depending on an arbitrary function of the scalar only. We call these base Lagrangians *the Fab Four*,

$$\mathcal{L}_{john} = \sqrt{-g}V_{john}(\phi)G^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla_\nu\phi \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{paul} = \sqrt{-g}V_{paul}(\phi)P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla_\alpha\phi\nabla_\nu\phi\nabla_\beta\phi \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{george} = \sqrt{-g}V_{george}(\phi)R \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{ringo} = \sqrt{-g}V_{ringo}(\phi)\hat{G} \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{G} = R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}R^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} - 4R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu} + R^2$  is the Gauss-Bonnet combination,  $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$  is the Levi-Civita tensor and  $P^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = -\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma}R_{\lambda\sigma\gamma\delta}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$  is the double dual of the Riemann tensor [9].

Our results prove that any self tuning scalar-tensor theory (satisfying EP) must be built from the Fab Four. The weakest of the four is Ringo since this cannot give rise to self-tuning without “a little help from [its] friends”, John and Paul. When this is the case, Ringo does have a non-trivial effect on the cosmological dynamics but does not spoil self-tuning. George also has difficulties in going solo: when  $V_{george} = \text{const.}$ , we just have GR and no self-tuning, whereas when  $V_{george} \neq \text{const.}$ , we have Brans-Dicke gravity with  $w = 0$ , which does self-tune but is immediately ruled out by solar system constraints. Thus it is best to consider *the Fab Four* as combining to give a single theory, as opposed to four different theories in their own right. In particular we expect that one should always include John and/or Paul for the reasons given above, and because their non-trivial derivative interactions might give rise to Vainshtein effects [11] that would help in passing solar system tests. Chameleon effects [12] may also play an important role in this regard.

## HORNDESKI'S THEORY

The most general second-order scalar tensor theory is

$$S = S_H[g_{\mu\nu}, \phi] + S_m[g_{\mu\nu}; \Psi_n] \quad (5)$$

where the Horndeski action,  $S_H = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \mathcal{L}_H$ , is obtained from equation (4.21) of [1],

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \delta_{\mu\nu\sigma}^{ijk} \left[ \kappa_1 \nabla^\mu \nabla_i \phi R_{jk}{}^{\nu\sigma} - \frac{4}{3} \kappa_{1,\rho} \nabla^\mu \nabla_i \phi \nabla^\nu \nabla_j \phi \nabla^\sigma \nabla_k \phi + \kappa_3 \nabla_i \phi \nabla^\mu \phi R_{jk}{}^{\nu\sigma} - 4 \kappa_{3,\rho} \nabla_i \phi \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \nabla_j \phi \nabla^\sigma \nabla_k \phi \right] \quad (6)$$

$$+ \delta_{\mu\nu}^{ij} [(F + 2W) R_{ij}{}^{\mu\nu} - 4 F_{,\rho} \nabla^\mu \nabla_i \phi \nabla^\nu \nabla_j \phi + 2 \kappa_8 \nabla_i \phi \nabla^\mu \phi \nabla^\nu \nabla_j \phi] - 3[2(F + 2W)_{,\phi} + \rho \kappa_8] \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \phi + \kappa_9(\phi, \rho),$$

with  $\rho = \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla^\mu \phi$  and  $\delta_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_n}^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} = n! \delta_{\mu_1}^{[i_1} \delta_{\mu_2}^{i_2} \dots \delta_{\mu_n}^{i_n]}$ . We have four arbitrary functions of  $\phi$  and  $\rho$ ,  $\kappa_i = \kappa_i(\phi, \rho)$  as well as  $F = F(\phi, \rho)$ , which is constrained so that  $F_{,\rho} = \kappa_{1,\phi} - \kappa_3 - 2\rho \kappa_{3,\rho}$ . Note that  $W = W(\phi)$ , which means that it can be absorbed into a redefinition of  $F(\phi, \rho)$ . The matter part of the action is given by  $S_m[g_{\mu\nu}; \Psi_n]$ , where we require that the matter fields,  $\Psi_n$ , are all minimally coupled to the metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$ . This follows (without further loss of generality) from assuming that there is no violation of equivalence principle<sup>1</sup>. This reasoning is consistent with the original construction of Brans-Dicke gravity [3].

Here we are interested in Horndeski's theory on FLRW backgrounds, for which we have a homogeneous scalar,  $\phi = \phi(t)$ , and a homogeneous and isotropic metric,

$$g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = -dt^2 + a^2(t) \left[ \frac{dr^2}{1 - \kappa r^2} + r^2 d\Omega_{(2)} \right] \quad (7)$$

with  $\kappa$  being a (positive or negative) constant, specifying the spatial curvature. Plugging this into (6), we obtain an effective Horndeski Lagrangian in the minisuperspace approximation

$$L_H^{\text{eff}}(a, \dot{a}, \phi, \dot{\phi}) = a^3 \sum_{n=0}^3 \left( X_n - Y_n \frac{\kappa}{a^2} \right) H^n \quad (8)$$

where  $H = \dot{a}/a$  is the Hubble parameter, and we have,

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= -\tilde{Q}_{7,\phi} \dot{\phi} + \kappa_9, & X_1 &= 3(2\kappa_8 \dot{\phi}^3 - 4F_{,\phi} \dot{\phi} + Q_7 \dot{\phi} - \tilde{Q}_7), \\ X_2 &= -12(F + F_{,\rho} \dot{\phi}^2), & X_3 &= 8\kappa_{1,\rho} \dot{\phi}^3, \\ Y_0 &= \tilde{Q}_{1,\phi} \dot{\phi} + 12\kappa_3 \dot{\phi}^2 - 12F, & Y_1 &= \tilde{Q}_1 - Q_1 \dot{\phi} \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_1 = \partial \tilde{Q}_1 / \partial \dot{\phi} = -12\kappa_1$  and  $Q_7 = \partial \tilde{Q}_7 / \partial \dot{\phi} = 6F_{,\phi} - 3\dot{\phi}^2 \kappa_8$ . In a cosmological setting, the matter action contributes a homogeneous and isotropic fluid with

energy density  $\rho_m$  and pressure  $p_m$ , satisfying the usual conservation law  $\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(\rho_m + p_m) = 0$ .

The generalized Friedmann equation follows in the standard manner by computing the Hamiltonian density for the Horndeski Lagrangian, and identifying it with the energy density,  $\rho_m$ , as follows

$$\mathcal{H}(a, \dot{a}, \phi, \dot{\phi}) = \frac{1}{a^3} \left[ \dot{a} \frac{\partial L_H^{\text{eff}}}{\partial \dot{a}} + \dot{\phi} \frac{\partial L_H^{\text{eff}}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} - L_H^{\text{eff}} \right] = -\rho_m \quad (9)$$

Since matter only couples directly to the metric, and not the scalar, the scalar equation of motion is given by

$$\mathcal{E}(a, \dot{a}, \ddot{a}, \phi, \dot{\phi}, \ddot{\phi}) = \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \frac{\partial L_H^{\text{eff}}}{\partial \dot{\phi}} \right] - \frac{\partial L_H^{\text{eff}}}{\partial \phi} = 0 \quad (10)$$

Note that this equation is always linear in both  $\ddot{a}$  and  $\ddot{\phi}$ .

## SELF-TUNING

Since our ultimate goal is to identify those corners of Horndeski's theory that exhibit self-tuning, we first ask what it means to self-tune, in a relatively model independent way. Consider our cosmological background in vacuum. The matter sector is expected to contribute a constant vacuum energy density, which we identify with the cosmological constant,  $\langle \rho_m \rangle_{\text{vac}} = \rho_\Lambda$ . In a self tuning scenario, this should not impact on the curvature, so whatever the value of  $\rho_\Lambda$ , we have a Minkowski spacetime<sup>2</sup>, with  $H^2 + \kappa/a^2 = 0$ . This should remain true even when the matter sector goes through a phase-transition, changing the overall value of  $\rho_\Lambda$  by a constant amount. This extra requirement will place the strongest constraints on our theory.

In order to proceed we shall take these transitions to be instantaneous, thereby assuming that  $\rho_\Lambda$  evolves in a piecewise constant fashion. Now consider a self-tuning solution,  $H^2 + \kappa/a^2 = 0$ ,  $\phi = \phi_\Lambda(t)$ , satisfying the "on-shell-in-a"<sup>3</sup> equations of motion for the metric

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = -\rho_\Lambda \quad (11)$$

<sup>1</sup> For EP to hold all matter must be minimally coupled to the same metric,  $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}$ , and this should only be a function of  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and  $\phi$ . Dependence on derivatives is not allowed since it would result in the gravitational coupling to matter being momentum dependent, leading to violations of EP. Given  $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}(g_{\alpha\beta}, \phi)$ , we simply compute  $g_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}(\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \phi)$ , and substitute back into the action (5), before dropping the tildes. Since this procedure will not generate any additional derivatives in the equations of motion, it simply serves to redefine the Horndeski potentials,  $\kappa_i(\phi, \rho)$ .

<sup>2</sup> Different values of  $\kappa$  represent different slicings of Minkowski space:  $\kappa = 0$  corresponds to Minkowski coordinates;  $\kappa < 0$  corresponds to Milne coordinates;  $\kappa > 0$  is not permitted since one cannot foliate Minkowski space with spherical spatial sections.

<sup>3</sup> By "on-shell-in-a" we mean that we have set  $H^2 = -\kappa/a^2$ . We shall see later that this is indeed a consistent solution to our system.

and the scalar,

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, \ddot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = \ddot{\phi}_\Lambda f(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) + g(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = 0 \quad (12)$$

Suppose that a phase transition occurs at some arbitrary time  $t = t_*$ , so that  $\rho_\Lambda(t_*^-) \neq \rho_\Lambda(t_*^+)$ . We require that the scalar field is continuous at the transition,  $\phi_\Lambda(t_*^-) = \phi_\Lambda(t_*^+)$ , but allow its derivative to jump,  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda(t_*^-) \neq \dot{\phi}_\Lambda(t_*^+)$ . We first consider equation (11). This is discontinuous on the right hand side, so it must also be discontinuous on the left, which means that  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$  must have some non-trivial  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda$  dependence. Next consider equation (12). As  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda$  is discontinuous,  $\ddot{\phi}_\Lambda$  must run into a delta function at  $t = t_*$ . This is not supported on the right hand side of equation (12), and since  $t_*$  can be chosen arbitrarily, we deduce that  $f$  must vanish independently of  $g$ , so that (12) actually splits into two equations

$$f(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = 0, \quad g(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = 0 \quad (13)$$

Focusing on the former it is clear that if  $f$  has nontrivial dependence of  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda$  then it may be discontinuous at the transition. Since it is constrained to vanish either side of the transition we deduce that  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{\phi}_\Lambda} = 0$ , or equivalently  $f = f(\phi_\Lambda, a)$ . Using this simplified form for  $f$ , we now take derivatives, staying on-shell-in-a, so that we have

$$\frac{df}{dt}(\phi_\Lambda, \dot{\phi}_\Lambda, a) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_\Lambda} \dot{\phi}_\Lambda + \frac{\partial f}{\partial a} \sqrt{-\kappa} = 0 \quad (14)$$

Again, applying similar logic we now conclude that  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \phi_\Lambda} = 0$  or equivalently  $f = f(a)$ . An identical line of argument implies that  $g = g(a)$ . What this tells us is that the on-shell-in-a scalar equation of motion (12) has lost all dependence on the scalar field  $\phi_\Lambda$  and its derivatives.  $\phi_\Lambda(t)$  is fixed by the gravity equation (11), and must necessarily retain some non-trivial time dependence even away from transitions in order to evade the clutches of Weinberg's theorem. More generally, in order to cope with transitions the on-shell-in-a gravity equation (11) must depend on  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda$ . The scalar equation (10) should vanish identically on a flat spacetime, and must therefore have the schematic form.

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left[ A_n + \tilde{A}_n \frac{d}{dt} \right] \Delta_n \quad (15)$$

where  $A_n = \ddot{\phi}_\Lambda(\phi, \dot{\phi}, a) + \beta(\phi, \dot{\phi}, a)$ ,  $\tilde{A}_n = \ddot{\phi}_\Lambda(\phi, \dot{\phi}, a) + \tilde{\beta}(\phi, \dot{\phi}, a)$  and we define

$$\Delta_n = H^n - \left( \frac{\sqrt{-\kappa}}{a} \right)^n \quad (16)$$

which vanishes on-shell-in-a for  $n > 0$ . Since the scalar equation (10) ultimately forces self-tuning, it should not be trivial. Furthermore, for a remotely viable cosmology it should be dynamical in the sense that we can *evolve*

towards  $H^2 + \kappa/a^2 = 0$  rather than having it be true at all times. This imposes the condition that at least one of the  $\tilde{A}_n$  should be non-vanishing. Note that the sum does not include  $n = 0$ , which is absolutely crucial in order to force self-tuning

Let us now apply the self-tuning filters to Horndeski's theory. Using equation (10) we can infer the following form of the minisuperspace Lagrangian in a self tuning set-up,

$$L_{\text{self-tun}}^{\text{eff}} = a^3 \left[ c(a) + \sum_{n=1}^3 Z_n(\phi, \dot{\phi}, a) \Delta_n \right]. \quad (17)$$

In order for the on-shell-in-a gravity equation (11) to retain dependence on  $\dot{\phi}_\Lambda$  we demand that  $\sum_{n=1}^3 n Z_{n,\dot{\phi}} \left( \frac{\sqrt{-\kappa}}{a} \right)^n \neq 0$ . By requiring (8) to take the form (17) up to a total derivative, we find that we must have  $\kappa < 0$ , and that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 &= 2V'_{\text{ringo}}(\phi) \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} \ln(|\rho|) \right] - \frac{3}{8} V_{\text{paul}}(\phi) \rho \\ \kappa_3 &= V''_{\text{ringo}}(\phi) \ln(|\rho|) - \frac{1}{8} V'_{\text{paul}}(\phi) \rho - \frac{1}{4} V_{\text{john}}(\phi) [1 - \ln(|\rho|)] \\ \kappa_8 &= \frac{1}{2} V'_{\text{john}}(\phi) \ln(|\rho|), \quad \kappa_9 = -\rho_\Lambda^{\text{bare}} - 3V''_{\text{george}}(\phi) \rho \\ F &= \frac{1}{2} V_{\text{george}}(\phi) - \frac{1}{4} V_{\text{john}}(\phi) \rho \ln(|\rho|) \end{aligned}$$

with  $V'_{\text{george}} \equiv 0$  allowed, if and only if there exist other non-vanishing potentials. It follows that the self-tuning version of Horndeski's theory must take the form

$$S^{\text{self-tun}} = \int d^4x [\mathcal{L}_{\text{john}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{paul}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{george}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ringo}} - \sqrt{-g} \rho_\Lambda^{\text{bare}}] + S_m[g_{\mu\nu}; \Psi_n] \quad (18)$$

where the base Lagrangians are built from *the Fab Four* (1) to (4). Note also the presence of the bare cosmological constant term  $\rho_\Lambda^{\text{bare}}$  which can always be absorbed into a renormalisation of the vacuum energy (contained within  $S_m$ ). This serves as a good consistency check of our derivation. Such a term had to be allowed by the self-tuning theories – if it had not been there it would have amounted to fine tuning the vacuum energy.

## THE COSMOLOGY OF THE FAB FOUR

We shall now briefly present the cosmological equations for the general self-tuning theory (18). To this end, we note that the minisuperspace Lagrangians for *the Fab Four* have the desired structure given by equation (17), and that the Friedmann equations describing this cosmology are

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{john}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{paul}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{george}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{ringo}} = -[\rho_\Lambda + \rho_{\text{matter}}] \quad (19)$$

where we have absorbed  $\rho_\Lambda^{\text{bare}}$  into the vacuum energy contribution  $\rho_\Lambda$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{john} &= 3V_{john}(\phi)\dot{\phi}^2 \left(3H^2 + \frac{\kappa}{a^2}\right) \\ \mathcal{H}_{paul} &= -3V_{paul}(\phi)\dot{\phi}^3 H \left(5H^2 + 3\frac{\kappa}{a^2}\right) \\ \mathcal{H}_{george} &= -6V_{george}(\phi) \left[ \left(H^2 + \frac{\kappa}{a^2}\right) + H\dot{\phi} \frac{V'_{george}}{V_{george}} \right] \\ \mathcal{H}_{ringo} &= -24V'_{ringo}(\phi)\dot{\phi}H \left(H^2 + \frac{\kappa}{a^2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

The scalar equations of motion are  $\mathcal{E}_{john} + \mathcal{E}_{paul} + \mathcal{E}_{george} + \mathcal{E}_{ringo} = 0$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{john} &= 6\frac{d}{dt} \left[ a^3 V_{john}(\phi) \dot{\phi} \Delta_2 \right] - 3a^3 V'_{john}(\phi) \dot{\phi}^2 \Delta_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_{paul} &= -9\frac{d}{dt} \left[ a^3 V_{paul}(\phi) \dot{\phi}^2 H \Delta_2 \right] + 3a^3 V'_{paul}(\phi) \dot{\phi}^3 H \Delta_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_{george} &= -6\frac{d}{dt} \left[ a^3 V'_{george}(\phi) \Delta_1 \right] + 6a^3 V''_{george}(\phi) \dot{\phi} \Delta_1 \\ &\quad + 6a^3 V'_{george}(\phi) \Delta_1^2 \\ \mathcal{E}_{ringo} &= -24V'_{ringo}(\phi) \frac{d}{dt} \left[ a^3 \left( \frac{\kappa}{a^2} \Delta_1 + \frac{1}{3} \Delta_3 \right) \right]\end{aligned}$$

We see that on-shell-in-a,  $H^2 = -\kappa/a^2$ , Ringo's contribution to the Friedmann equation loses its dependence on  $\dot{\phi}$ . This explains why Ringo cannot self-tune by itself. We should emphasize that Ringo does not *spoil* self-tuning when John and/or Paul are also present, even though it *does* alter the cosmological dynamics. Note also that if  $V'_{george} = 0$ , and all the other potentials are vanishing, then the scalar equation of motion becomes trivial and does not force self-tuning.

For a generic combination of *the Fab Four* that includes John and/or Paul, we have a scalar tensor model of self-tuning. The self-tuning is forced by the scalar equation of motion, while the gravity equation links phase transitions in vacuum energy to discontinuities in the temporal derivative of the scalar field. On self-tuning vacua, the scalar field is explicitly time dependent, as it must be in order to evade Weinberg's theorem [7]. A detailed study of *Fab Four* cosmology will be presented elsewhere.

## DISCUSSION

In this letter we have resurrected Horndeski's theory that describes the most general scalar-tensor theory with second order field equations. We have asked which corners of this theory admit a consistent self-tuning mechanism for solving the (old) cosmological constant problem. Remarkably, this reduces the theory down to a combination of four base Lagrangians, dubbed *the Fab Four*. Self-tuning is made possible by breaking Poincaré invariance in the scalar sector.

There are hints at some deep underlying structure in this theory. This merits further investigation, but for now we note that each of *the Fab Four* can be associated with a dimensionally enhanced Euler density. This is immediately evident for George and Ringo, whereas for John and Paul we note that they can both be written in the form  $V(\phi)\nabla_\mu\phi\nabla_\nu\phi\frac{\delta W}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}$ , with  $W_{john} = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}R$  and  $W_{paul} = -\frac{1}{4}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\phi\hat{G}$ .

Have we *really* solved the cosmological constant problem? We have certainly evaded Weinberg's theorem, but there is plenty more to consider. Does the *Fab Four* ultimately give rise to a gravity theory that is phenomenologically consistent, in particular at the level of both cosmology and solar system tests. This is a work in progress, but there are reasons to be guardedly optimistic, especially when one considers the fact that John and Paul contain non-trivial derivative interactions that may give rise to a successful Vainshtein effect. Relevant work involving three of *the Fab Four* was carried out in [10].

We should also ask whether or not the self-tuning property of *the Fab Four* is spoilt by radiative corrections. Chances are it probably is spoilt by matter loops, but it is interesting to note that the self-tuning is imposed by the scalar equation of motion, and the scalar does not couple directly to matter. The intriguing geometric properties of *the Fab Four* may also play a role here, but such considerations are beyond the scope of this letter.

In any event, the ethos behind our approach is not to make any grandiose claims regarding a solution of the cosmological constant problem but to ask what can be achieved in this direction at the level of a scalar tensor theory. Given that our starting point was the most general scalar tensor theory, we should be in a position to make some reasonably general statements. As we have shown, Weinberg's theorem alone is not enough to rule out possible self-tuning mechanisms, so even if *the Fab Four* are ultimately ruled out by other considerations we should be able to say we have learnt something about the obstacles towards solving the cosmological constant problem and how one might think about extending the scope of Weinberg's theorem.

EJC and AP acknowledge financial support from the Royal Society and CC from STR-COSMO, ANR-09-BLAN-0157. AP notes that he was born in the same hospital as John Lennon.

- 
- [1] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **10** (1974) 363-384.
  - [2] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, C. Skordis, [arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO]].
  - [3] C. Brans, R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124** (1961) 925-935.
  - [4] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese, A. Vikman, Phys. Rev. **D79** (2009) 084003. [arXiv:0901.1314 [hep-th]].
  - [5] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki, A. Vikman, JCAP **1010** (2010) 026. [arXiv:1008.0048 [hep-th]].

- F. P. Silva, K. Koyama, Phys. Rev. **D80** (2009) 121301. [arXiv:0909.4538 [astro-ph.CO]]. T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, J. 'i. Yokoyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** (2010) 231302. [arXiv:1008.0603 [hep-th]]. A. De Felice, S. Tsujikawa, [arXiv:1008.4236 [hep-th]]. C. Deffayet, S. Deser and G. Esposito-Farese, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 064015 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1967]. C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer, G. Zahariade, [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]]. T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi, J. 'i. Yokoyama, [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].
- [6] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. **D79** (2009) 064036. [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].
- [7] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989) 1-23.
- [8] A. Padilla, P. M. Saffin, S. -Y. Zhou, JHEP **1012** (2010) 031. [arXiv:1007.5424 [hep-th]]. A. Padilla, P. M. Saffin, S. -Y. Zhou, JHEP **1101** (2011) 099. [arXiv:1008.3312 [hep-th]].
- [9] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, J. A. Wheeler, San Francisco 1973, 1279p.
- [10] L. Amendola, C. Charmousis and S. C. Davis, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 084009 (2008) [arXiv:0801.4339 [gr-qc]].
- [11] A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. **B39** (1972) 393-394. N. Kaloper, A. Padilla, N. Tanahashi, *in preparation*
- [12] J. Khoury, A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 171104. [astro-ph/0309300].